David Lifton
11818 1/2 Dorothy St.,
Los Angeles, Ca. 90049

6/11/75

Dave,

You are transparent.

And experienced as you are at it, you are not even a good liar. Except, of course, to those who see your self-serving carbons only.

I did not imagine that your letter was dated the 14th or that it was not postmarked until a week later.

There is no change and in fact the content eliminates the possibility that you wrote it the 17th. It refers to your phone conversation with Jim Lesar of the 14th beginning with "This morning." You made handwritten corrections but none of the date.

When you write me about your regrets about the "raw deals" I get from others it is like a whore protesting love. On this my files abound in the unsolicited.

Nor is there any rational basis for the pretense that you did not want to "impose" on Jim's relationship with me. Any approach to the lawyer only on a matter he is handling for a client is an imposition on him. Your lack of bona fides is apparent when you did not phone or write me instead of Jim. Without asking me - after I had announced publicly that I will be giving all this away - you made a pitch to him.

Only after you recognized the impropriety of this did you write me the self-serving letter that may have cost you the previous meal. The postmark gives it away.

Nor does your pretense of this noble desire to "help" stack. If you had this desire, all you had to do was ask me how you could help. I knew a little about your education. I also knew you could do what you did. SO I'd have had no reluctance in taking you at your word because I knew you could have gotten copies the way you did anyway. I'd have sent you copies and I'd have told you how you could help. Whether you'd have helped or not, the cost to you would have been less than from your deviousness.

But on this question of your selfless desire to "help," it has been a month since you were told how and you have been silent.

One consequence of all this trickery of yours is that you will have less than you otherwise would have had and those who do not promise not to give you anything will now get nothing from me. The reason is not personal. The book in which I would have incorporated this is camera ready if and when I can pay the printer and I'll not be able to incorporate it. The reason is precisely what I said, to be able to succeed in the entire endeavor. There are ways in which this can be damaged and my interest was and is to protect against them.

You have limitless gall, you the guy who wrote the Times as you did and without vomiting all over yout typewriter say "you should be pleased to know that I am one person who will cause you no touble." (Quite aside from an incredible record of other such incidents.) In quoting the rest of this sentence I'll underscore the words that are subject to question, evasions, the kinds of things a sneakthief like you builds in:

"by either doing anything publicly with this material just now, or doing anything in court which could in any way be detrimental to your FOI case."

Who decides what you mean by these meanginless words? Do you think I have no idea how long, for example, it would take you to get into court on this? And for what would you go to court? Have you for any other material? "Publicly" is the only way there can be hurt to this endeavor? "Just now" is the only time "publicly?" Or as it can relate to "doing?"

Good old selfless Dave, noble of purpose and pure in heart an bound only to "help." Well, in 1970 I filed a similar suit. And it was public. You knew. And you had by then had this fine education and God knows what connections. How could it be that there was no offer of "help" then - none until I got papers shaken loose?

You are so used to playing games with infants or those who know you for what you are but say nothing you have become insensitive to your own stupidities. Now you claim that you wrote me the day you wrote Jim and told him ("quite frankly," you described it) that you had decided - without asking me for copies - "to order my own copy." I suppose it was the inbred honesty in you that caused you to omit any reference to this in writing me? The same day and no rrefence in your letter to me?

How honest and "frank" can one man be?

And after a decade of indifference on this on your part and after you tell Jim you want only to "help," why this sudden need to "order my own copies" without asking me for copies?

The Latin I used means "A stiff prick has no conscience."

Let there be no confusion. My only interest is to keep anyone from messing up what is possible and has nothing to do with number. If anyone does, regardless of how, I will dedicate myself to seeing to it that he is suitably rewarded.

If the condom fits, wear it.

Good old "help" giving Dave!

Is this what you have been doing in all those efforts to obtain my work by stealth behind my back? Is this why you asked another rather than me for my available work on the King case? Without telling him of your arrangements with Wakeford-Orloff? Is this why you then called and chided him when Wakeford-Orloff reported back to you what I had written?

With "help" like yours who needs the unhelpful?

Last I heard you and W-O had sued each other. Could you extend your special concept of "help" to giving me copies of the papers each of you filed? I sure would like to see them and I can't pay the court copying costs.

Your arrogance, too, is something to ponder. You are more of an expert on the meanings of the figures than Guinn?

You are modest to a character fault.

You make a silly mistake to write me these kinds of childish letters. All you want is a carbon to flash. You are better off with the carbons and without me having the originals and a chance to response. Why should you worry about copies in my files as testimonial to your "help" and "frankness" and all those other good things about you or about my responses? Just make yourself phoney carbons.

It will be as honest as anything else you do.

The rest of your greasy kid stuff is unworthy, too.

Sincere disgust,

Harold Weisberg